



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The nations shall learn war no more.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF PEACE BETWEEN
INDIVIDUALS, CLASSES AND NATIONS.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.
SINGLE NUMBERS, TEN CENTS.

Address all communications to

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
3 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.

THE UNITED STATES AS MEDIATOR.

The reputation that the United States has of being friendly in the true sense to all nations is a hundred fold more honorable to her than any which she might have gained by trying to get a foothold in other countries and by pushing her own interests everywhere without regard to the rights of other and weaker races. There is not a nation in the world that considers this country her enemy.

How has this reputation been won? By the faithful carrying out of the policy of non-interference in the affairs of others, by keeping out of entangling alliances and by treating other nations, as a rule, with justice and fairness. There have been temporary failures, without doubt, to maintain this policy, at least in some of its parts, but they have not been sufficient to compromise seriously the historic reputation of the nation.

This national reputation has naturally caused different nations, in times of misunderstanding, to turn to this country for her friendly offices. Our Presidents have been made arbiters in a number of important difficulties. A conspicuous illustration of the power which such a name confers has been given in the course of the war still unended between China and Japan. The two most conspicuous foreign representatives in these two countries have been ministers Denby and Dunn. Whatever they have said or offered to do, whether accepted or not, has been invariably received as coming from a sincere desire to promote the best interests of both countries. The offers of mediation which have been made by our State Department, though declined, have been treated with a courtesy and consideration shown to no other country.

We would not underrate the efforts which the British Foreign Office has put forth to try to end the unfortunate struggle. The present Prime Minister, Lord Rosebery, is unquestionably a man of peace. We have not the least doubt that his efforts have been made in entire sin-

cerity and without any undue reference to British interests in the East. So far as we know, Lord Kimberly, the Secretary of State, is in entire sympathy with him, and so is a steadily growing portion of all classes of the nation. But England has a bad reputation, which she can not get over in a day, no matter what the personnel of the Government and the Foreign Office may be. It was perfectly natural, therefore, that the proffer of her friendly offices should be bluntly declined. Her colonial extension has been so marked everywhere by an unscrupulous policy of grab and hold, that she is not trusted anywhere. We wish it were otherwise, but this is the simple historic truth which no amount of glossing over can ever change. If our own country had followed a similar policy and had built up a navy in aid of its execution, she might to-day have owned(?) every foot of land on the American Continent. But her policy has been steadily the opposite, and if she ever forsakes it, as some *un-patriotic* Americans would have her do, she would justly merit the strongest condemnation and distrust of the world.

As the end of the war in the East has been seen to be rapidly approaching, China has naturally, therefore, turned to the United States to seek aid in arranging the terms of peace, and the invitation sent to Hon. John W. Foster, ex-Secretary of State, to act as the special adviser of the Chinese plenipotentiaries is one of the greatest compliments that could have been paid to this country. It is true that Mr. Foster does not go as an official representative of the Government, but his eminence as a diplomatist and his former position at the head of the State Department make his mission to all intents and purposes official. The Japanese Minister at Washington has expressed his personal gratification at the appointment, and it is thought that Mr. Foster's presence at the deliberations of the envoys of the two governments at Tokio will not only hasten the conclusion of the terms of peace, but will secure their being honorable to China as well as to Japan. Everybody will hope that the mission may prove to be an eminently successful one, and that the cruel war may speedily come to an end.

Americans can not better serve their country or exhibit the highest order of patriotism than by helping to maintain inviolate that kind of foreign policy which makes us pre-eminently the peacemaker among the nations of the world. We shall be a thousand-fold more glorious to have led the world to peace, than to have conquered and possessed the whole of it by war.

RUSSIA AND PEACE.

Mr. Sergius Stepniak, in the December number of the *North American Review*, gives his reasons for believing that there is no danger to the peace of Europe from the side of Russia. He is of the opinion that the danger of overthrow of the present autocratic form of government which a war would bring is so great that no Czar would